Modern Physics Letters A,
© World Scientific Publishing Company

arXiv:gr-qc/9703073v1 25 Mar 1997

VACUUM FLUCTUATIONS AS A SOURCE OF ADIABATIC PERTURBATIONS IN POWER LAW INFLATIONARY COSMOLOGY

Milan Mijić *
Department of Physics and Astronomy, California State University
Los Angeles, CA 90032
and Institute for Physics, P.O. Box 522
11001 Belgrade, Yugoslavia

Received November 29, 1996

An analysis of the decoherence of quantum fluctuations shows that production of classical adiabatic density perturbations may not take place in models of power-law inflation, $a(t) \sim t^p$, with $1 < p < 3$. Some consequences for models of extended inflation are pointed out. In general, the condition for decoherence places new constraint on inflationary models, which does not depend on often complicated subsequent evolution.

Among many attractive features of inflationary cosmology,[1,2] two stand out as perhaps the deepest and the most successful ones: the solution to horizon problem, and the mechanism for quantum origin of the primordial inhomogeneities.[3] At the same time, inflation is now in a peculiar state, rightly characterized as a paradigm in search of the theory.[2] Perhaps even more troubling is a persistent discrepancy between the observed low value of the density parameter and standard inflationary prediction of $|\Omega - 1| \ll 1$.

It seems reasonable in this situation to complement search for new models with an examination of the stability and generality of those features of inflation which seem most desirable to persist in future cosmology. The mechanism for generation of primordial perturbations probably belongs to this category. While this kind of investigation is usually restricted to evaluation of spectra, statistics, and overal normalization of the perturbations, we wish to supplement such analysis with the examination of possible decoherence of quantum fluctuations. That is, we would first like to see whether vacuum fluctuations in a given cosmological model eventually do behave as (a source of) classical density perturbations.

This problem may be approached fairly generally. Let ϕ stands for a homogeneous, minimally coupled scalar quantum field with potential $V(\phi)$, which drives a Robertson-Walker cosmological expansion with Hubble parameter H, while $\delta\phi(\vec{x}, t)$ denotes small, inhomogeneous fluctuations. The later quantity obeys the linearized field equation,[4]

* e-mail address: milan@moumee.calstatela.edu

$$\delta\ddot{\phi} + 3H\delta\dot{\phi} - a^{-2}\nabla^2\delta\phi + V''(\phi)\delta\phi = 0 \quad . \tag{1}$$

After expanding the field $\delta\phi$ into modes counted by the wave number k, introducing the conformal time η as $dt = S(\eta)d\eta$, $S(\eta) = a(t)$, and the rescaled modes χ as $\delta\phi = \chi/S(\eta)$, (the index k will be suppressed), the one-mode equation of motion becomes that for a time-dependent oscillator:

$$\chi''(\eta) + \omega^2(\eta)\chi(\eta) = 0 \quad , \tag{2}$$

$$\omega^2(\eta) = k^2 + m^2(\eta)S^2 - S''/S \quad . \tag{3}$$

The time-dependent "mass" $m^2(\eta) \equiv V''(\phi)$ is to be evaluated from the solution of the equation of motion for field ϕ. Behavior of the frequency determines the one-mode amplitude, from which one can calculate the occupation number $n_k(t) \equiv \langle 0|a_k^\dagger(t)a_k(t)|0\rangle$. If, at late times (to be specified), this quantity becomes much greater than unity, fluctuations of that comoving wavelength are effectively classical.[5] This is the approach that we will follow here. A very similar physical picture, with somewhat different emphasis, has been thoroughly developed in Ref. 6. For other approaches to the decoherence of quantum fluctuations in inflationary universe, see Ref.'s 7 and 8.

In this paper we will extend the study of decoherence to quantum fluctuations in models of power law inflation.[9] It is a broad class of spatially flat, exact inflationary solutions with expansion $a(t) = At^p,\ p > 1$, driven by an exponential potential,[10]

$$V(\phi) = V_0\ e^{2\phi/M} \quad , \quad M \equiv \left(\frac{p}{4\pi G}\right)^{1/2} \quad . \tag{4}$$

This situation occurs in several extensions of General Relativity, such as supergravity, Kaluza-Klein models, or Brans-Dicke gravity.[2]

The analysis of decoherence for power law expansion turns out to be rather easy, due to the remarkable similarity with the massive De Sitter models, studied in Ref. 5. In later case the evolution equation (2) is Bessel equation, with solutions given as $\chi(z) = \sqrt{z}B_\nu(z)$, $z \equiv -k\eta \in (0, \infty)$. B_ν is some Bessel function that satisfys chosen initial conditions. The late time ($z \to 0^+$) behavior of particle number was found to have the following simple form:[5]

Particle number diverges when ν is real and different from $1/2$, and it is bounded, oscillatory function, always less than unity when ν is imaginary.

Large occupation number in a given mode means that quasi-particles formed a classical condensate. Thus, in terms of mass, we have that,

The vacuum fluctuations of massive fields on exact De Sitter background lead to classical density perturbations only for $m^2/H_0^2 < 2$, and $2 < m^2 \leq 9H_0^2/4$, while those of heavier fields do not.

H_0 stands for the constant Hubble parameter of the De Sitter space. The $m^2 = 2H_0^2$ case is exceptional, as it is conformally related to flat spacetime, so there is

no particle production whatsoever.[11] While $m^2/H_0^2 \ll 2$ regime applies to standard slow-roll models,[2] the decoherence of heavy fields in a narrow range $m^2/H_0^2 \in (2, 9/4]$, comes somewhat as surprise, since in this case the potential is not of upside-down shape, and the standard explanation of Guth and Pi[7] does not seem to apply. The physics of this case is discussed in Ref. 12.

Returning to the power law inflation, we can express the scale factor in the conformal time as $S(\eta) = B|\eta|^{p/(1-p)}$, $\eta \in (-\infty, 0)$, and, $B \equiv A^{1/(1-p)}(p-1)^{p/(1-p)}$. The one-mode frequency (3) becomes,

$$\omega^2(\eta) = \alpha|\eta|^{-q} - \beta|\eta|^{-2} + k^2 \quad , \tag{5}$$

with $\alpha \equiv m^2B^2 \geq 0$, $q \equiv 2p/(p-1)$, and $\beta \equiv p(2p-1)/(p-1)^2$.

The adiabatic perturbations are thought to originate in fluctuations of a field ϕ which drives the inflationary expansion.[3] One feature of such field in spatially flat power law expansion is that both kinetic and potential energy density vary as $1/t^2$. This implies $m^2(t) \equiv \partial^2 V(\phi)/\partial\phi^2 = 2(3p-1)/t^2$. After introducing the new variable $z \equiv -k\eta \in (0, \infty)$, the expression for one-mode frequency (3) becomes,

$$\omega^2(z) = 1 + \frac{y(p)}{z^2} \ , \quad y(p) \equiv \frac{-2p^2 + 7p - 2}{(p-1)^2} \quad . \tag{6}$$

Remarkably, the oscillator equation (2) again has the Bessel form, so the one-mode amplitude will be given through Bessel function of the order $\nu^2 = 1/4 - y(p)$. Since the late time behavior is again attained in the $z \to 0^+$ limit, this case reduces to that of a massive field on De Sitter background, and we can apply the results obtained there. ν^2 has zeros at $p = 1/3$ and $p = 3$, and it takes negative values between them. Therefore, we conclude that,

The vacuum fluctuations of inflaton field which drives $a(t) \sim t^p$ power law inflation decohere only if $p \geq 3$.

For $1 < p < 3$, since ν is imaginary, the vacuum fluctuations do not lead to generation of a classical (adiabatic) density perturbations, despite the inflationary expansion.

The corresponding two characteristic values are as follows: for $\nu = 0$, we have $m^2/H_0^2 = 9/4$ in De Sitter case, and $p = 3$ for case of power law inflation; $\nu = 1/2$ corresponds to $m^2/H_0^2 = 2$ in De Sitter case, and $p = p_+ \equiv (7 + \sqrt{33})/4 \approx 3.186$, which is the larger zero of the function $y(p)$ in the power law case.

The significance of the later value may be seen in several ways. First, the relative change in one-mode frequency behaves as,

$$\left|\frac{\omega'}{\omega}\right| = \frac{|y(p)|}{z|z^2 + y(p)|} \quad . \tag{7}$$

Denominator vanishes at $z_0 = |y(p)|^{1/2}$, providing that $y(p)$ takes negative value. This can happen only for $p > p_+$, since the other zero is at $p_- = (7 - \sqrt{33})/4 \approx$

$0.314 < 1$. This blow-up in $|\omega'/\omega|$ leads to the divergence in the occupation number, but as in De Sitter case it is due to the shrinking phase space ($\omega^2(z_0) = 0$), rather than to large occupation number, and it has no physical significance. More importantly, for the same range of the parameter p, the oscillators turn upside down at that moment. And soon after, for *all* values of p, the change in frequency starts its rapid $1/z$ growth. Those two effects, working together, are responsible for the decoherence of fluctuations in $p > p_+$ models, when the oscillators are upside down. In a narrow range $p \in (3, p_+)$ the oscillators are upside-right, and the fluctuations decohere only because of the rapid change in frequency.[5,12]

Further significance of the power $p = p_+$ may be seen from the fact that the moment at which the wavelength of the mode equals the Hubble radius is given as $z_{hc} = p/(p-1)$. As $p \to \infty$, the ratio z_0/z_{hc} approaches the De Sitter value of $\sqrt{2}$, and drops to zero as $p \to p_+$. This is because for $p < p_+$ the oscillator is upside right, while just above that value the frequency starts its rapid growth only at asymptotically late times. The fluctuations for $p = p_+$ correspond to massless field conformally related to flat spacetime. To see this, one may use Ref. 11 to evaluate the scalar curvature in power law models as $R = 6p(2p-1)/t^2$. We have that $m^2(t) = R(t)/6$ holds only if $y(p) = 0$. Thus, in this case there is no difference between the equation (1) and that for a massless, conformally coupled field, $(\partial^2 + R/6)\delta\phi = 0$.

[As a side remark, let us point out that results above do not depend on the usual ambiguity how we choose our quasi-particles. Let us choose some initial state, and let $(a, a^\dagger)$ and $(b, b^\dagger)$ denote annihilation and creation operators for two choices of quasi-particles. Both choices will be given as linear combinations of the one-mode amplitude and the associated momentum, but with a different coefficients. The two sets are related through the Bogoliubov coefficients (α_B, β_B), constrained as $|\alpha_B|^2 - |\beta_B|^2 = 1$ as both sets satisfy creation/annihilation algebra. If, at any moment of time, we have a state with a definite number of a particles, the expectation value of b particle number operator in that state is given as,

$$n_b(z) = n_a(z) + |\beta_B|^2 \quad . \tag{8}$$

The second term on the right hand side can not be negative. Therefore, if $n_a(z)$ diverges as $z \to 0$, so does n_b.]

What we saw so far should be sufficient to illustrate that the study of decoherence in inflationary cosmology does not merely confirm the expectations, but leads to new restrictions on useful inflationary models. Not every inflationary model leads to classical density perturbations. To go one step further, let us briefly consider consequences of this analysis for a popular category of power law inflationary solutions, that of the so-called extended inflation.[13]

Results obtained here should be applied to the picture in Einstein frame, where fluctuations can be cast in the form of equation (1). The power of the expansion p is given through the Brans-Dicke field self-coupling b as, $p = b/2 + 3/4$. Production of density perturbations in these models have been considered by several authors.[14]

The amplitude of the inhomogeneity of a wavelength λ, as it re-enters the Hubble radius in recent epoch, has been found to vary as $\lambda^{4/(2b-1)}$. A hope has been expressed that this departure from the scale-invariant spectrum may have some observational support. However, none of these studies checked whether quantum fluctuations indeed decohere in all of the cases. The classical nature of fluctuations was assumed in analogy with the slow-rolling new inflationary models,[3] but just as this thinking has been justified, for instance, by the analysis of Guth and Pi,[7] a similar check should be done here. As we have seen, for fluctuations in power-law models to be classical we must have $p \geq 3$. This implies that useful inflation must have Brans-Dicke self coupling bounded as $b > 4.5$, and the enhancement towards longer wavelengths can not be faster than $\lambda^{1/2}$.

The picture is even more dramatic if we consider the spectrum of inhomogeneities, $P(k)$, at some arbitrary (later) moment, when mode is inside the Hubble radius. It follows that $P(k) \sim k^{(2b-9)/(2b-1)}$, which translates into $P(k) \sim k^{(p-3)/(p-1)}$. This approaches the Harrison-Zeldovich spectrum at large p, but it only flattens out as p decreases. The enhancement towards larger scales does not occur, as it corresponds to $p < 3$ expansion in which fluctuations do not decohere. And, in particular, some of the versions of the extended inflation which rely on the slower expansion towards the end of that phase will not work. The constraint $b > 4.5$ that follows from the decoherence constraint increases the lower bound on Brans-Dicke coupling, usually thought to be bounded only as $b > 1.5$.[13]

A word of caution should be inserted here. The decoherence criteria that we have used is expressed through the magnitude of the occupation number for a given mode. When this number is much larger than unity, inhomogeneity of a given wavelength may be considered classical. This certainly looks reasonable, and it is sufficient to explain the classical nature of modes outside the Hubble radius in De Sitter universe.[5] It also agrees in its physics with the criteria used by Guth and Pi,[7] or slightly generalizes it.[12] However, all this is very different from other mechanisms of decoherence,[8] which rely on the presence of interaction of fluctuations with some other fields which are then traced out. This looks plausible, and similar to the decoherence processes in laboratory setting. The challenge of that picture is that in each separate situation one must clearly state which fields are to be kept track of, and which are to be summed over and why. It is possible that the mechanism of this kind would lead to the classicality of fluctuations even in power law models with $p < 3$, but it is important to bear in mind that this is something to be investigated, and not to be assumed just because the expansion is inflationary. If such mechanism exists, the rate of decoherence will depend on some coupling constant, which may lead to additional constraints on the model.

To conclude, let us recall that there are many inflationary models that pass various criteria, and it is still too early to say whether any of them has particular advantage over the others. Placing constraints on a model from comparison with the present day universe is mandatory, but tricky business. For example, the use of fluctuations for the formation of large scale structure depends on a number of details

in a specific cosmological scenario. Most of the recent models use more than one scalar field, and the evolution is rather complicated. In contrast, the decoherence analysis done here produces criteria for successful inflationary cosmology which is based on the requirement for the very existence of classical inhomogeneities. As such, this statement is very robust, as it does not depend on details of the subsequent evolution. The method that we have used here may in principle be applied to any other, exact or approximate, scalar field driven cosmological model.

References

1. A. Guth, *Phys. Rev. D23* (1981) 347.
2. E. Kolb and M.S. Turner, *The Early Universe*, (Addison Wesley, 1990); A. Linde, *Particle Physics and Inflationary Cosmology*, (Harwood Academic Press, 1990).
3. S.W. Hawking, *Phys. Lett. 115B* (1982) 295; A.A. Starobinsky, *Phys. Lett. 117B* (1982) 175; A. Guth and S-Y. Pi,*Phys. Rev. Lett. 49* (1982) 1110; J.M. Bardeen, P.J. Steinhardt, and M.S. Turner, *Phys. Rev. D28* (1983) 679.
4. A. Guth and S-Y. Pi, Ref. 2.
5. M. Mijić, Cal State LA preprint, August 1996 (submitted).
6. D. Polarski and A.A. Starobinsky, *Class. Quan. Grav. 13* (1996) 377; J. Lesgourgues, D. Polarski, and A.A. Starobinsky, preprint gr-qc/9611019.
7. A. Guth and S-Y. Pi, *Phys. Rev. D32* (1985) 1899.
8. M. Sakagami, *Prog. Theor. Phys. 79* (1985) 443; R. Brandenberger, R. Laflamme, and M. Mijić, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A 28* (1990) 2311; Y. Nambu, *Phys. Lett. 276B* (1992) 11; B.L. Hu, J.P. Paz, and Y. Zhang, in *The Origin of Structure in the Universe*, ed. E. Gunzig and P. Nardone, (Kluwer, 1993).
9. L. Abbott and M. Wise, *Nucl. Phys. B224* (1984) 541; F. Lucchin and S. Matarese, *Phys. Rev. D32* (1985) 1316.
10. G.F.R. Ellis and M. Madsen, *Class. Quan. Grav. 8* (1991) 667; F. Lucchin and S. Matarese, Ref. 9.
11. N.D. Birrell and P.C.W. Davies, *Quantum Fields in Curved Space*, (Cambridge University Press 1982).
12. M. Mijić, Cal State LA preprint, December 1996 (submitted).
13. D. La and P. Steinhardt *Phys. Rev. Lett. 62* (1989) 376; *ibid*, *Phys. Lett. 220B* (1989) 375; D. La, P. Steinhardt, and E. Bertshinger, *Phys. Lett. 231B* (1989) 231.
14. E. Kolb, D. Salopek, and M.S. Turner, *Phys. Rev. D42* (1990) 3925; A.H. Guth and B. Jain, *Phys. Rev. D45* (1992) 426; R. Crittenden and P.J. Steinhardt, *Phys. Lett. 293B* (1992) 32.